

EXHIBIT E

Subject STATEMENT FROM ELAINE KAPLAN, OPM
GENERAL COUNSEL

STATEMENT FROM ELAINE KAPLAN, OPM GENERAL COUNSEL

There have been some developments in the Ninth Circuit regarding access to benefits for same-sex spouses of federal employees, and there's some confusion over this important issue. Specifically, Karen Golinski, an employee of the Federal Courts, filed a grievance against her employer claiming that the denial of enrollment of her same-sex spouse in the Federal Employees Health Benefits Plan (FEHBP) violated the Ninth Circuit's Equal Employment Opportunity policy. Ninth Circuit Chief Judge Alex Kozinski, sitting in his administrative capacity, and not as a federal judge in a court case, said that employees of the court were entitled to FEHBP health benefits for their same-sex spouses. OPM must administer the FEHBP in a lawful manner, and the Department of Justice (DOJ) has advised OPM that providing those benefits would violate the so-called "Defense of Marriage Act."

All federal employees – be they in the Executive, Legislative or Judicial branch – receive their health care benefits in the FEHBP, which is administered by OPM. Spouses and minor children of federal employees are eligible to be enrolled in the FEHBP. However, in 1996, the so-called "Defense of Marriage Act" was signed into law and it states that the word "spouse," when used in a federal statute, can mean only opposite-sex spouses. In other words, the current federal law means that same-sex spouses are ineligible to be enrolled in federal benefit programs that define eligibility based on their status as spouses. As the President has explained, the Administration believes that this law is discriminatory and needs to be repealed by Congress – that is why President Obama has stated that he opposes DOMA and supports its legislative repeal. He also has said he supports the Domestic Partner Benefits and Obligations Act (DPBO), which would allow all same-sex domestic partners of federal employees to receive federal benefits, including enrollment in the FEHB Plan.

It's important to understand that Judge Kozinski was acting as an administrative official in this matter, reacting to the concerns of an employee of the judiciary. He was not acting as a federal judge in a court case. This does not mean that the inability to extend benefits to Karen Golinski's spouse is any less real or less painful, but it is a critical point.

The decision in this matter was not reached lightly – after we learned of this development, we examined our options and consulted with the DOJ. DOJ advised us that the order issued by Judge Kozinski does not supersede our obligation to comply

with existing law because it is not binding on OPM, as it was issued in his administrative capacity, and not as a judge in a court case. Thus, this type of order does not change the existing law, which DOJ concludes prevents the enrollment. DOJ also advised us that DOMA prohibits same-sex spouses of federal employees from enrolling in the FEHBP and that the law does not permit OPM to allow this enrollment to proceed.

This issue shows exactly why Congress needs to repeal DOMA and pass the DPBO. In fact, the passage of the DPBO would remedy this situation in a way that reaches beyond this individual case involving an employee of the judiciary by providing benefits to same-sex domestic partners of all federal employees across the government whether or not they are married. That is why the Administration has testified before Congress on this crucial legislation, and why the President has personally called for its passage.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE BY CERTIFIED MAIL
(Fed. R. Civ. Proc. Rule 5(b))

I declare that I am employed with the law firm of Morrison & Foerster LLP, whose address is 425 Market Street, San Francisco, California 94105-2482; I am not a party to the within cause; I am over the age of eighteen years and I am readily familiar with Morrison & Foerster's practice for collection and processing of correspondence for mailing with the United States Postal Service and know that in the ordinary course of Morrison & Foerster's business practice the document described below will be deposited with the United States Postal Service on the same date that it is placed at Morrison & Foerster with postage thereon fully prepaid for collection and mailing.

I further declare that on the date hereof I served a copy of:

COMPLAINT

on the following by placing a true copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope addressed as follows for collection and mailing at Morrison & Foerster LLP, 425 Market Street, San Francisco, California 94105-2482, in accordance with Morrison & Foerster's ordinary business practices:

United States Office of Personnel Management
Theodore Roosevelt Building
1900 E Street NW, Room 7355
Washington, DC 20415

Joseph P. Russoniello, Esq.
U. S. Attorney for the Northern District of California
450 Golden Gate Avenue, 10th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102

Eric Holder, Esq.
Attorney General of the United States
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Steven Y. Bressler, Esq.
Trial Attorney
U. S. Department of Justice
Civil Division
Federal Programs Branch
P. O. Box 883
Washington, DC 20044

I declare under penalty of perjury that the above is true and correct.

Executed at San Francisco, California, this 20th day of January, 2010.

Janie Fogel
(typed)

(signature)